

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Final Office Action of August 19, 2009, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended.

In the Office Action, Claims 1, 4, 5/1, 6, 7, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent No. 3,065,893 to *Basford*. In addition, Claims 2, 3, 5/2, and 5/3 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Basford* in view of CA Patent No. 1161385 to *McGinnis*. Further, Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Basford* in view of CA Patent No. 1161385 to *McGinnis* and FR Patent No. 2425394 to *McGinnis*. It is respectfully submitted that *Basford* does not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended independent claims 1 and 11 and dependent claims 2 – 10 and 12 – 13 for the following reasons.

First, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include a “drivable connection.” Claim 1 has been amended to read in relevant part “each of the rotatable members having a respective drivable connection with a motor.” Claim 11 has been amended to read in relevant part “using a motor connected to each of the rotatable members by a respective drivable connection to drive each of the rotatable members.”

In the current application, it is the driven rollers that impart the different speeds to the two portions of each of the traction members, one portion moving from the first/second roller to the third/fourth roller, and the other portion moving back from the third/fourth roller to the first/second roller. Therefore, all the rollers are motor driven by means of “drivable connections” with the

motor, this drive connection making it possible to maintain the difference between the first speed and the second speed.

In stark contrast, *Basford* discloses first (34) and third (28) rotatable members that are drive pulleys (Column 2, lines 12-15) and second (36) and fourth (30) rotatable members that are idler pulleys (Column 2, lines 12-15). Therefore, all four rotatable members are not each driven by a drivable connection with a motor but rather are addressed by a drive means through shafts, gearing, or belts. (see page 5 of Final Office Action).

In addition, Applicant still maintains all the points that it raised in the previous response, specifically that it is impossible for the idler rollers of *Basford* to maintain continuously a different speed to the driven rollers, because of the keying of each belt with corresponding recesses in the driven and idler rollers, even if such a difference in speed was momentarily possible, the difference would be imparted from the extrusion to the belt, not from the driven or idler rollers to the belt.

Accordingly, for at least the above discussed reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2 – 10, which include all of the features of independent claim 1, and independent claim 11 and dependent claims 12-13, which include all of the features of independent claim 11, are not anticipated or made obvious by the cited prior art references.

It is submitted that the above amendments place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the application is resubmitted for reconsideration. A favorable action is respectfully requested. It is believed that no fees are due with this reply. However, if a fee should

Application No. 10/502,230
Amendment in Response to Final Office Action of August 19, 2009

be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 50/1039.

Respectfully submitted,

/joel h. bock/

Joel H. Bock
Registration No. 29,045

COOK ALEX LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: (312) 236-8500

October 19, 2009